



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/766,318	01/28/2004	Vernon R. Berg	1327.18133-PROV FOR	1205
26308	7590	10/27/2004	EXAMINER	
RYAN KROMHOLZ & MANION, S.C. POST OFFICE BOX 26618 MILWAUKEE, WI 53226			HAYES, BRET C	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3644	
DATE MAILED: 10/27/2004				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/766,318

Applicant(s)

BERG, VERNON R.

Examiner

Bret C Hayes

Art Unit

3644

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 2,3 and 6 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 28 January 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|--|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>04/26/2004</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

1. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: page 3, line 35, “40” should be --140--.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Objections

2. Claim 13 is objected to because of the following informalities: line 2, insert --:-- (a colon) after “providing”, and remove “an”. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4. Claims 2, 3 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

5. Re – claims 2 and 3, the recitation that the switches are “carried by a housing” is improper idiomatic English and unclear. Examiner suggests, --mounted in a housing-- or --mounted on a housing--, depending upon the intent of the disclosure.

6. Re – claim 6, likewise, the recitations that the housings are ‘for carrying’ are unclear.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

7. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

Art Unit: 3644

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

8. Claims 1 – 5 and 9 – 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by US Patent No. 4,319,678 to Hesler.

9. Re – claim 1, Hesler discloses the claimed invention including: a device for cleaning animal waste from stalls comprising: a first motorized drum **138**; a second motorized drum **148**; a cable **115** extending between said first **138** and said second **148** motorized drums; a scraper **10** carried by said cable **115**; a switch tripper **50, 60** carried by said cable **115**; a switch **201, 202** in communication with said first motorized drum **138**; said switch **201, 202** responsive to said switch tripper **50, 60** to perform at least one of the following: moving the cable **115** in a first direction **112**, moving the cable **115** in a second direction **113**, and stopping movement of said cable **115**.

10. Re – claims 2 and 3, while Hesler does not explicitly disclose the switch **201, 202** being carried by a housing, it is inherent in the art of sensor switches to place the electronics in some type of a housing in order to prevent corrosion of the electrical elements, and, from Fig. 1, for example, it would appear that the switches **201, 202** are being ‘carried by housings’.

11. Re – claim 4, Hesler further discloses an override stop **200** between the switch **201, 202** and the second drum **148**.

12. Re – claim 5, Hesler further discloses a wheel **175** for such a purpose.

13. Re – claims 9 and 10, Hesler further discloses a control box **200** with manual operable controls, see col. 10, lines 34 – 37, for example, and the controls including forward, reverse, stop and go in communication with the drums **138, 148**, see col. 10, lines 29 – 62, for example.

Art Unit: 3644

14. Re – claim 11, Hesler further discloses the drums 138, 148 being coupled with a motor 123 by a roller chain drive 126.

15. Concerning method claims 12 and 13, in view of the structure disclosed by Hesler as provided above, the method of operating the device would have been inherent, since it is the normal and logical manner in which the device could be used.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

16. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

17. Claims 6 – 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hesler as applied above.

18. Re – claim 6, Hesler discloses the invention substantially as claimed including a drum housing (the base that the entirety of the mechanism rests upon, see Fig. 6, for example) except for a first drum housing ^{and} a second drum housing for carrying the drums 138, 148. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use multiple housing for carrying the drums, since it has been held that mere duplication of the essential working parts of a device involves only routine skill in the art. *St. Regis Paper Co. v. Bemis Co.*, 193 USPQ 8.

19. Re – claim 7, Hesler discloses the invention substantially as claimed as applied above. Hesler discloses the housing being ‘canted’ from a direction of travel 112, 113. Also, it is inherent in any mechanical set up not requiring exceeding precision with regard to cable drawing

Art Unit: 3644

direction, perhaps especially so for a set up of this nature in a livestock containment unit, for the housing to be at least somewhat 'canted' as the necessity of being 'dead on' accurate with respect to the cable drawing direction in this application is minimal and probably only 'eyeballed' at best.

20. Re – claim 8, Hesler further discloses the drums 138, 148 being coupled to the housing by a bearing 139 – apparently 'pillow block' type bearings.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Bret Hayes at telephone number (703) 306 – 0553. The examiner can normally be reached Monday through Friday from 5:30 am to 3:00 pm, Eastern Standard Time.

If attempts to contact the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Teri Luu, can be reached at (703) 305 – 7421. The fax number is (703) 872 – 9306.

bh

10/20/04



TERI P. LUU
SUPERVISORY PRIMARY EXAMINER